DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 654 IR 000 315

TITLE Institute On Information Needs and Library Education; Narrative Report (September 1, 1971 through September 30, 1972).

INSTITUTION South Carolina Univ., Columbia. Coll. of Librarianship.

PUB DATE 72

NOTE 67p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE

DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Objectives; Budgets; Community Surveys; Course Descriptions; Curriculum Design; *Curriculum Development; Group Discussion; Group Dynamics; *Information Needs; *Institutes (Training Programs); Librarians; *Library Education; Participant Characteristics; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Scheduling; Teamwork

IDENTIFIERS University of South Carolina

ABSTRACT

Since South Carolina had depended on graduate library schools outside the state for its source of professional library manpower, it was necessary for the University of South Carolina to establish in the State's first graduate library school a program that was relevant to the information needs in South Carolina. During 1971-72, ten library educators were recruited for the faculty of a new graduate library school. The purpose of the institute was for these ten educators to achieve three main goals: 1) to formulate goals and objectives for a new professional graduate school; 2) to design a curriculum consistent with the goals and objectives; 3) to select teaching methods and techniques capable of maximizing learning. They worked to achieve these goals through group dynamics. Both the process and the product of the program were observed and evaluated at various points during the year. Assistance and assessment came from both the University personnel on the campus and from individuals of other institutions and recommendations concerned strengthening faculty and other resources to guarantee continuation of the innovative features of the projected program. (Author/CH)

ED 089654

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INSTITUTE ON INFORMATION NEEDS AND LIBRARY EDUCATION

Narrative Report

September 1, 1971 - September 30, 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

College of Librarianship

University of South Carolina

Columbia, S. C.

1972

IR 000 315

SUMMARY

The Institute on Information Needs and Library Education of the College of Librarianship at the University of South Carolina had three main goals in 1971-72: (1) to formulate goals and objectives for a new professional graduate school; (2) to design a curriculum consistent with these goals and objectives; and (3) to select teaching methods and techniques capable of maximizing learning. During the Institute year, the Participants were ten library educators recruited for the faculty of a new graduate library school, the first one established in the State. They worked to acheive those goals through group dynamics.

The Insticute's locale was Davis College on the campus of the University of South Carolina and its focus was the design of a library education program calculated to improve information access in the State. However, the Participants recognized that the achievement of the Institute's goals had broader implications for library education in general.

The Institute was a team effort, although sub-groups and Committees assumed responsibility for tasks and activities involving the community study, curriculum development, facilities and instructional methodology, and student interviews and admissions. All of the Participants attended a University sponsored seminar in teaching, which culminated with an introduction to sensitivity training conducted by two staff members of the National Training Laboratory.

Both the process and the product of the program were observed and evaluated at various points during the year. Assistance and assessment came from both the University personnel on the campus and from individuals from other

institutions. Staff members in the University's Social Problems Research Institute, the School of Social Work, and Undergraduate Library Education program gave suggestions and evaluations of certain aspects of the developing program. Outside Library educators from the University of Pittsburgh Graduate School of Library and Information Sciences, the graduate library school at the University of Toledo, and the Graduate School of Library Service at Rutgers attended the Institute at different times and provided objective criticism and reaction to tentative plans.

The six-person evaluatory team made the principal evaluation of the product - a proposed curriculum. The team consisted of four library educators, a parcticing librarian and a sociologist. Their evaluation, arrived at from printed descriptions, group disucssions and individual consultations, resulted in a formal report of findings and recommendations. Principal findings were that the product was a sound one, and recommendations concerned strengthening faculty and other resources to guarantee indefinite continuation of the innovative features of the projected program.

CONTEXT

Locale

The Institute on Information Needs and Library Education is located at the University of South Carolina in Columbia, the capital of the State. South Carolina is a State of interesting and dramatic contrasts, a State whose two and a half million citizens recently celebrated its founding in 1670. The Piedmont Plateau, or the "up-country" differs in its geographical, cultural, and demographic characteristics from Coastal Plains Region, or the "low-country". Charleston is an old and distinguished cultural center; Columbia is a strategically located center of governmental activity and home of the State's largest institution of higher education. At the same time, the per capita income in South Carolina is second lowest in the nation. Urban population increased nineteen percent in the past decade, yet half of the State's residents still live in rural areas. Williamsburg County has one of the most severly disadvantaged populations in the United States. South Carolina has an enviable reputation for its agricultural and industrial development, yet thirty percent of its population are functionally illiterate. The Provincial Library of Charles Towne, the first public library in this country, was established in 1698; yet the South Carolina State Library Board, the predecessor of the South Carolina State Library was not established until 1929. During the long history of this State, two wars fought on its land were destructive and disruptive to life here. Involvement in more recent wars has also adversely affected economic and social development in the State.

The University is the oldest and largest center of graduate study and research in South Carolina's tax-supported higher education system. Its enrollment in

thirteen colleges and schools includes over 15,000 students on the Columbia campus, 2000 of whom are engaged in graduate studies, and over 4000 students on seven regional campuses. The University awards associate, baccalaureate, master's and doctoral degrees, and it is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The University's libraries contain over a million volumes, the equivalent of another 700,000 volumes in microtext, and over a million and a half manuscripts. Most of the latter are preserved in the South Caroliniana Library. The libraries and other resources support studies in the liberal arts, business administration, education, engineering, journalism, law, librarianship, nursing, pharmacy, and social work. During the past decade, the State has generously supported the University's expansion of professional education in South Carolina. Legislative funding for a graduate library school at the University is the most recent manifestation of this policy.

Background of Program

The need for a graduate library school in South Carolina has been an objective of some library leaders for many years. The State has provided undergraduate library curricula at five institutions of higher education for a long time. The University of South Carolina has offered courses in library science since 1920 and in 1954 established a curriculum for majors in the College of Education preparing for school librarianship. The latter program was the first of its kind in the State to be approved by NCATE. Nevertheless, those persons seeking graduate professional education in librarianship had to go outside the state. Despite some financial support under the Southern Regional Education Board's contract program and under the S. C. State Library's training grant program, economic factors have limited the supply of professional manpower available to South Carolina libraries during periods when the State's need for librarians was increasing steadily with development and expansion in all types of libraries.

Library leaders and trustees of public libraries recommended to Governor McNair and the General Assembly that South Carolina establish with tax revenue a graduate library school in the State. The University of South Carolina was selected as the home of the new School because of its demonstrated success in professional graduate education, its well-developed graduate programs in related disciplines, its outstanding library resources, and its strategic location in the State. In 1968, the General Assembly included in the appropriation for the University of South Carolina, the first financial support for a graduate library school. During the next two fiscal years, Kenneth E. Toombs, Director of Libraries, administered the special appropriation for the school. Some of the funds were used to support the search for a Dean but the major part of the funds were used to acquire library materials in the broad fields of library and information science.

A survey of library manpower in South Carolina was conducted in 1970 by Mr. Andrew Geddes, a consultant who is a librarian in New York. He analyzed the present professional staff positions, number of budgeted vacancies, number of annual replacements and number of librarians needed in 1975 for anticipated growth. As of January 1970, there were 42 budgeted vacancies in academic, special, and public libraries with an anticipated replacement need for 27 additional librarians and a projected need for 196 librarians by 1975. The need for librarians was much greater in public schools, since only 30 percent of the schools had librarians with master' degrees in charge of their libraries, and 19 percent of the schools used librarians with masters degrees in education or some other discipline. Sixty-seven percent of the school librarians had 24 semester hours of library science courses, and the rest had 18 or less semester hours. The annual replacement rate reported was 55 librarians, and an additional 563 librarians will be needed for the expansion of school library services by 1975.

While the University continued its search for a Dean, the Director of Libraries appointed Miss Joyce Taylor to accelerate the selection and acquisition of library resources to support a Master's curriculum in library science. In July 1971 Miss Taylor was succeeded by Miss Jean Rhyne who worked with the Participants during the Institute.

The search for a Dean culminated in the appointment of Dr. Wayne S. Yenawine and in September 1970 he assumed responsibility for recruiting a faculty and designing a multi-purpose basic curriculum in librarianship to replace the undergraduate school media center oriented library science program offered in the University's College of Education. President Jones, Provost Patterson, and Willard Davis, Vice President for Graduate Study and Research, agreed to give Dean Yenawine a year to recruit a faculty and to give that faculty a year to plan the new Master's program. During 1970/71, Dean Yenawine discussed his plans for the following year with several staff members in the Office of Education of the federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Interest was expressed in the plans to identify the nature of information needs in the South Carolina community, to identify the cognitive and human competencies required to satisfy those needs, to design an environment and experiences that would maximize learning, and to enroll students in the new program. That interest was confirmed in June 1971 by a grant of $32,585 for travel, consultants, and supportive staff costs during the Institute year, 1971/72. The grant supplemented the University's general funding of the Institute [OEG-0-71-8521 (319)] for 13 months. The present report is an evaluation of the entire period covered by the grant, which assisted in establishing the College of Librarianship at the University of South Carolina.

PROGRAM

Scope

The Institute opened September 1, 1971 and concluded on September 30, 1972, a period of time during which the faculty recruited to establish a new graduate school completed the planning for the school and brought the school into operation. Specifically the objectives of the Institute were:

1) To research the community to identify the needs for information, measure the extent to which existing information services fulfill those needs, and identify unfulfilled needs;

2) To design a curriculum of basic professional library education calculated to prepare librarians to satisfy known needs;

3) To select teaching methods and instructional techniques likely to maximize learning

4) To select students and orient them to the curriculum.

The Participants were the faculty planners. Dean Yenawine had been authorized to recruit ten of the most capable faculty members available. During 1970/71, he investigated over one hundred prospective candidates. His objectives were to recruit a faculty that included men and women, young and mature library educators, blacks and whites, and librarians with experience in the several types of libraries and various functions performed in libraries. The Dean sought candidates who were responsive to the opportunity and challenge the University offered, pioneer-spirited, imaginative, and above all, intelligent. The Dean also sought candidates who by interest, personality, and communication skills could function successfully in a group. Although ten faculty members were authorized the failure to recruit black librarians reduced the number to eight. Three additional faculty members joined the Participants in August, 1972 and at the same time one of the original Participants returned to the practice of librarianship.

The Institute was conducted in Davis College on the University of South Carolina's campus, the Litchfield Inn on the State's coast, and at the Kanuga Conference Center in the State's "up-country". While the purpose of the Institute was clearly defined, the process by which the purpose was achieved became a major concern. The Institute was a planning year and the hidden agenda was group development. Therefore, the Institute was significant to the Participants not only because of the opportunity they had to establish a new graduate library school but also because of the opportunity they had for personal growth in group dynamics.

Personnel

The Participants were behaviorists, aware of the urgent need to create, through the curriculum of the graduate library school, student empathy and responsiveness to the needs for library/information services. They were aware of the need to develop the librarians skills and competencies essential for successful human interaction and community involvement. All believed that successful human relations in satisfying needs through library/information services is what we really mean by relevant service, the best justification of a community's investment in library resources. Furthermore, all agreed that the study of human relations combined with the philosophy, materials, methodology, and technology of their profession is information science and the use of information science is librarianship.

All Participants agreed that libraries are institutions created in our society to store, mobilize, and disseminate information regardless of publication form and that librarians are specially educated to idenitfy and satisfy needs for information wherever they exist. Two basic assumptions shared by the Participants were that, 1) change affecting libraries and library education is constant; and 2) relevant library education in the 1970's prepares the librarian to function in libraries today and to effect change in realizing

the potential of librarianship tomorrow.

The Participants believed that the Institute was an opportunity to rethink current problems in graduate professional education and library education in particular. They accepted the situation as a challenge to redefine the core curriculum of a multi-purpose master's program, to integrate library science and information science, and to design a learning environment relevant to the needs for library/information services in an era of social change. Since South Carolina had depended on graduate library schools outside the state for its source of professional library manpower, the Dean had a mandate from the University to establish in the State's first graduate library school a program that was relevant to the information needs in South Carolina.

The problem of the Institute was to design a curriculum for the master's degree in librarianship to be offered to students in 1972/73. The problem involved studying people's needs for information and library service, formulating program goals reflecting these needs, defining cognitive and affective objectives for students, designing the curriculum, selecting instructional techniques and materials, and recruiting and enrolling students.

The problem was presented to the following participants, most of whom had never worked together before but all of whom had a strong personal interest in the problem:

Francis Atkinson is a specialist in instructional system development and communication who joined the faculty in September 1971 after teaching a year in USC's College of Education. He received his doctorate from Syracuse University, and he has already achieved an enviable reputation as a creative designer of learning environments. He is in demand as director of workshops for teachers and library administrators in the use of simulation and gaming techniques. He is also especially interested in the application of human relations training in the education process and in the study of futures.

Robert Bell is a librarian, book collector, ex-antiquarian book-seller, novelist and bibliographer, who recently chose to bring his rich background of experience to library education. He is completing his dissertation on the "History of the Grabhorn Press" and will receive his doctoral degree from the University of California at Berkeley. Lippincott published his novel, The Butterfly Tree, in 1958; he has also published a bibliography of Mobile, Alabama, and compiled a census of incunabula in the San Francisco Public Library. He has taught in the library education program at the Univeristy of California at Berkeley and at the University of San Francisco, and he joined the faculty in September 1971.

Nancy Burge, a native of South Carolina, transferred to the faculty after serving as Chairman of the Library Education Department in USC's College of Education since she established that undergraduate curriculum in school librarianship in 1954. Her professional career began with teaching, shifted to a combination of teaching and librarianship, to high school librarianship, to co-ordinator of school libraries, and just prior to her appointment at USC, she was Supervisor of School Library Services in the S. C. Department of Education.

She earned her master's degree in library science at George Peabody College for Teachers. She is widely recognized in the country as a library educator and is highly respected in the Southeast for the quality of the graduates of her program. Miss Burge's work in North and South Carolina and her active participation in the programs of state and regional library associations account for her extensive knowledge of libraries in this region.

Katherine Cveljo was born in the United States but grew up in Yugoslavia. When she came back to this country in the mid-50's she used her subject specialization in economics and her very versatile language skill in special libraries, and recently has shifted her talents to library education. She taught at Case-Western Reserve, the University of the State of New York at Geneseo and at Dalhousie University in Canada before joining the faculty in September 1971. She is a recognized authority and a distinguished teacher in bibliography, special library services and comparative international librarianship. She is currently completing the research for her dissertation on education for librarianship in Yugoslavia and will receive then her doctoral degree from Case-Western Reserve University.

Sue Hardin is a specialist in school librarianship who has had an unusually successful career first as a teacher and for ten years as a school librarian in Louisiana, Colorado and South Carolina. She has earned her master's degree from the University of Denver, and since September 1970 has been teaching with conspicuous success in USC's College of Education curriculum for school media specialists. She transferred to the faculty in September 1971 where she continued teaching undergraduate library education majors and participating in the Institute until August 1972.

Elspeth Pope is another highly successful librarian with a diversity of experience in both academic and special libraries who in mid-career chose to use her experience and talents in library education. She is an authority in cataloging, classification theory, and organization of information. She owns

and operates a private printing press which she not only enjoys as a hobby, but which she has used as a learning laboratory for students. She received her doctorate from the University of Pittsburgh's School of Library and Information Sciences. She taught library science at the University of the State of New York at Geneseo and at the University of Pittsburgh before joining the faculty in September 1971.

William Summers is well-known in the library profession as a public-librarian, former State Librarian in Florida, and a consultant on library systems. He joined the faculty in September 1971, at a time when his experience with the American Library Association's Committee on Accreditation was particularly useful in planning the curriculum of a new graduate library school. Dr. Summers is particularly interested in the political and economic aspects of librarianship and frequently reports the results of his research in professional journals. He received his Ph. D. degree from Rutgers University.

Wayne S. Yenawine is a specialist in academic librarianship with a strong interest in automation and library systems. He has had extensive experience in university libraries in Illinois, Georgia, Alabama, New York, and Kentucky. He received his professional education at the University of Illinois' Graduate School of Library Science and earned his doctoral degree there in 1955. He taught there and at Syracuse University where he wad Dean of the School of Library Science and Director of Libraries for nine years.

In August, 1972, three faculty members were added, and while they had not been a part of the Institute, they did share in the final phase of the Institute--the Kanuga Conference, which launched the instructional program devised during the planning year. These faculty members are:

Linda Hayes completed two years as Consultant to elementary school libraries in the S. C. State Department of Education before joining the faculty in August 1972. During the fall semester 1971/72, she taught a course in the curriculum for school media specialists and demonstrated outstanding talents as a library

educator. Her experience as a successful elementary school media specialist in North Carolina and Georgia together with her experience as a law librarian at Emory University brings an unusual and highly desirable combination of expertise to the faculty. Miss Hayes earned her master's degree at the University of Tennessee and plans to study for her doctoral degree at an early date.

Kathlyn Moses returned to her native state as a member of the faculty in August 1972, after six years of outstanding service as an Educational Specialist in the U. S. Office of Education. She received the Rockefeller Creative Award in recognition of her achievement at Spelman College and earned her B. S. and master's degree in Library Science at Columbia University. She began her professional career as a high school media specialist in Columbia, S. C., and was Chairman of the Library Science Department of S. C. State College. Her rich experience also includes work with young adults in the New York Public Library and the Yonkers (N.Y.) High School, and six years as a Supervisor of School Libraries in New York City. Mrs. Moses is a widely recognized consultant, author, and educator in school librarianship.

James Williams is a specialist in information science, an area of librarianship which utilizes systems analysis, communication theory, and computer science in the solution of library problems. He has had a variety of library and teaching experience, and most recently has been involved in teaching and research at the University of Pittsburgh where he recently completed his doctorate. Since 1964, he has been a Consultant in Systems Design and Computer Programming for Data Research and Development, in Lorain, Ohio. James Williams is not only a gifted teacher, but also a prodigious researcher and author.

The Participants were assisted by two secretaries, two clerk-typists, and two graduate research assistants, one a master's candidate in psychology and the other in political science. A part-time professional librarian in the University's library system serviced the information needs of the Participants and assembled laboratory collections.

Procedures

On September 2, 1971, the Participants met initially with President Thomas Jones, Vice Provost John Guilds, Dr. Willard Davis, Vice President for Advanced Studies and Research and Director of Libraries Kenneth Toombs. The guests and Dean Yenawine discussed the purpose of the Institute and the advanced planning for it. President Jones challenged the Participants to accept the heavy responsibility of establishing a new graduate library school that not only makes the profession exciting and appealing to student but also one that will produce willing and capable leaders. He urged the Participants to establish a school that makes sense for our area regardless of what other graduate library schools may be doing.

In preplanning, the Dean developed a schedule for the Institute's program. Participants would devote the first two months to an investigation of the demography, information needs and existing information services of South Carolina. Based on the information resulting from these studies, the Participants would then formulate goals and objectives for the graduate library school and publish an announcement of the projected new program. In the next period from November 1971 through February 1972, the Participants would design a curriculum calculated to achieve the school's goals and objectives, evaluate the curriculum plan, and publish a catalog describing the curriculum. During March, April and May 1972, the Participants would establish admission requirements, recruit students, and begin the selection of instructional methods, technology and materials to be used in implementing the curriculum. Then during the summer months, the Dean and his Assistant Dean, functioning as Institute Director and Assistant Institute Director, would prepare a detailed report for the University and the U. S Department of Health, Education and

Welfare. The final phase of the Institute program in September 1972 would involve the enrollment of students and the interaction of Participants and students in an Orientation Workshop at the Kanuga Conference Center.

The opening meeting of the Institute was both inspirational and informative. The Participants were not only enthusiastic and highly motivated but also intellectually challenged. During the next three months the Participants met almost daily during the work week in a conference room adjacent to their offices in Davis College. The Participants as a group accepted the responsibility for planning but agreed on the following assignments to share leadership and to provide direction for joint efforts:

William Summers - Community Study
Elspeth Pope - Goals and Curriculum
Katherine Cveljo - Recruitment, Orientation, Counselling, Admission and Degree requirements
Robert Bell - Public Relations, Announcements, Catalog
Francis Atkinson - Learning environment, Instructional technology, Educational Methodology

The first activity in the program was the community survey. The participants selected types of agencies and institutions they wished to look at--business, social, recreational, cultural, etc. The Participants, the Library Science Librarian and the Graduate Research Assistants assembled published information about the State and region. After studying the data and information in these sources, there were unanswered questions which it was believed could be more adequately answered by personal interviews in the field. Interview forms were drawn up, and training in interviewing techniques was provided the Participants through the Psychology Department. Participants interviewed a representative sample of the State's population including agency personnel, community leaders, and librarians. This activity continued during the first three months of the Institute, a month longer than planned. By the middle of November, Participants had identified the organizations in South Carolina which maintain information services and the nature of these services. They had also identified the major societal and technological forces affecting librarianship, the level of library

development and demographic trends in the community. The evidence confirmed the fact that the nature of the South Carolina community was not basically different from that of other communities and differed only in the dimension of problems affecting librarianship.

In this process it had become apparent by mid-October that the task of an in-depth analysis of the information needs and services even in the limited context of a single state would require far greater resources and time than would be available in light of the Participants' total responsibility in the Institute. Also it was agreed that a study of our community will be a primary, on-going concern of the Faculty of the new graduate library school on which work should be deferred until library school students could be directly involved as a learning experience in the curriculum.

While the Participants were working on the community survey, they were learning to know each other and how to function in a group. It was necessary to find the areas of agreement and conflict in philosophy of librarianship, attitudes about students, and feelings about our procedure. Time passed quickly with little tangible progress in the program. The Participants were frustrated by the time required to exchange views and reactions, discuss alternatives, and reach a group consensus. Some of the frustration resulted from the experience of learning to function effectively in a group. A few Participants had had useful previous experience; the others had had none. Everyone had personal adjustments to make and had difficulty accepting the Dean as a Participant. The eagerness to please others in the group, to be congenial, to be conciliatory, took its toll in loss of time. Healthy disagreement and honest surfacing of conflicting convictions would have made it easier and quicker to resolve conflict. The Adelphi technique was used successfully to establish priorities of action and establish preferences in major concerns. The early autonomy of the group was threatened by the conventional leader-follower roles. The Participants found some help in self-identifying and group interaction in a sensitivity training

workshops for teachers at the University directed by personnel from the National Training Laboratory. This workshop was the culmination of a series of demonstrations in teaching methods which all Participants attended during November.

In mid-October, the Participants agreed that other elements of the program (goals and objective, curriculum, admission requirements, teaching methodologies) were so interrelated that the pre-planned schedule was not valid. Therefore, the Participants agreed to scrap the original schedule and to proceed with all planned activities simultaneously throughout the rest of the Institute. The following Participants agreed to chair these working committees:

Goals and Curriculum	Elspeth Pope
Instructional Methodology	Francis Atkinson
Admissions	Katherine Cveljo
Publications	Robert Bell

Each of these Participants worked with two or three others in sub-groups defining tasks and doing the spade work involved. Committees met separately but brought results of planning to the Participants as a group for review, revision, and action. Francis Atkinson prepared a PERT chart establishing a November 1971 through June 1972 schedule for the completion of tasks as they were related to each other, the program of the Institute, institutional constraints, and the operational year of the graduate library school in 1972/73.

As guidelines for the Committee on Goals and Curriculum the Participants agreed that:

1) Graduate professional education should be intellectually challenging.

2) The core curriculum in Graduate library education should integrate the content as it is realistically used by the librarian.

3) Graduate library education should be an interdisciplinary and a multi-media program.

4) Graduate library education should be flexible to accommodate individual interests and career goals.

5) Graduate library education should combine library and information sciences.

6) Graduate library education should bridge the gap between the learning experience and the practice of librarianship.

7) Graduate library education should be student oriented.

At many times in the group's discussions, interest focused on the student's responsibility for the learning environment, relationships with peers and instructors, and professional development in the projected program. The Participants all agreed that they saw the student as a colleague and a responsible professional person. They saw the student as a person who is self-motivated and committed to librarianship. They saw the student as a responsive learner concerned with personal achievement rather than an accummulation of credits and involved in the planning and operation of the program. They saw the student in a developmental learning experience antecedent to the practice of librarianship. Questions of recruitment, selection and admission, degree requirements, and placement occupied a sub-group during November and December.

In January the Participants adopted the personal interview as an essential process in the selection of students. In compliance with established regulations of the University's Graduate School each applicant for admission would be required to complete an application form and provide a transcript of the applicant's previous academic study, two letters of recommendation, and the applicant's GRE score. The Participants also agreed that they would need information about the candidate's experience and education, career expectations and language skills, etc. that would not be available in the Graduate School's application form. A supplementary application form was drafted and approved. Copies of both forms are included in Appendix I. The group agreed that each applicant would be interviewed by three Participants each of whom would rate the candidate's emotional maturity, ability and openness in communicating feelings, personal motivation and interests, self-directedness, service-orientation, facility in relating to others, and appearance, The scale

provided for ratings from "superior" to "negative".

The Participants also agreed that students for the first class would be limited to forty, full-time students selected from among those who had expressed an interest in the projected program and were waiting for it to be operational as well as from among those who would respond to a published program announcement. The Assistant Dean accepted the Participant's proposal that he coordinate admissions procedures with the Graduate School Office and maintain the records of candidates for the new program in his office. During the spring he mailed a brochure about the projected program to libraries, schools, and to those who had inquired. He received requests for admission and scheduled interviews with the Participants. In several cases where distance prevented interviews at the University, well qualified librarians located near the applicant supplied the interview data.

Applicants were not rated against each other but rather in terms of predictability of their potential performance as professional librarians. Accordingly, more attention was given to motivation, personality, and ability to relate to others than to scores on the Graduate Records Examination or to grade point averages. Personal references were carefully reviewed. Pains were taken to avoid "elitism" in selection of candidates, for it was felt that a true test of the program would be observable change in attitudes about librarianship rather than guaranteed high-level performance. While no priorities were given in the selection process beyond the cumulative ratings and the time factor in applying, certain candidates from disadvantaged backgrounds or in financial difficulties were encouraged to enroll in the program by providing financial assistance through graduate or student assistantships.

Forty-seven students were admitted:

37 are women
6 are black
14 are over 30 years of age

41 are South Carolinians
6 have Master's degrees in other fields
21 have had no library experience
3 majored in library science as undergraduates

The Participants made diversity one of their goals in recruiting believing that it is a more valuable process to develop group identity and cohesion among diverse individuals than among homogenous individuals. Further, they believe that the profession needs diversity more than homogeneity. The applicants vary in life style from "far out" to "straight" and in personal philosophy from ultra-liberal to ultra-conservative. Characteristics of applicants will be used to establish a data base to be used in longitudinal studies of students and in evaluations of subsequent classes.

Concurrently, during November and December the Participants discussed goals and objectives trying to reconcile differing points of view, personal biases, and convictions. The resolution of philosophical issues was less difficult and time consuming than was the inevitable and continuous semantic problem. Efforts to clarify goals resulted in excessive specificity and efforts to broaden them resulted in esoteric generalities. The Participants deliberately went on to a consideration of teaching methods, alternative proposals for remodelling quarters in Davis College, the old Business Administration Building, and Pettigrew College, and proposals for the purchase of instructional equipment. They let the subject of goals get "cold" before resuming discussions of them with a fresh perspective. In January the Participants agreed that the curriculum should promote these goals for students.

1) Use learning experiences and a basic program of professional study to prepare for a career in librarianship.

2) Understand social, technological and cultural changes and become perceptive of their relationship to needs for information and library services.

3) Combine the useful knowledge derived from past library experience with new knowledge generated in the disciplines concerned with man's need for, acquisition, and use of information.

4) Become a self-directed learner as a basis for continuing education and professional growth throughout his career.

5) Acquire the skills and competencies to exert leadership in developing the future potentialities of librarianship.

These relate to the preparation for the practice of librarianship, adjustments to the changes that are taking place, and the merging of what we have inherited from the past and learned through research with what other disciplines have learned that is useful to librarians. The Participants recognized the importance of self-direction in the learning process and its influence on continuing education throughout a librarians's career. It was agreed that students should understand that regardless of the type of library work they are going to do, their reason for being is to satisfy the information needs of those in the community. It was also agreed that they must understand what changes are taking place that create new needs or alter existing needs for information, and particularly how the profession is responding to such changes.

These goals reflect a belief that the student should be prepared to take his place in the profession today. If he isn't prepared to take his place in librarianship as it is, he will never have an opportunity to effect change or to contribute leadership to the profession.

Implicit also in these goals is an understanding on the part of students of the role of technology in society today and an awareness of how technology is useful to librarianship. The Participants believed that librarians are in the communications business and there is a host of communication media available which, as McLuhan has said, are working us over all the time. It was agreed that the students should know how ideas are communicated, the process of disseminating information, and should understand how these processes operate in library services.

This emphasis on an understanding of the relevance of technology was one way the Participants believed the student could develop creativity. The Participants also believed that it was educationally sound to create a learning environment that stimulates motivation, personal interest, a sense of relevancy, etc., all of which directly affects the amount of learning that takes place. Further, they were very anxious to develop a program in which the reward of the student is the knowledge he learns, and the competencies he acquires.

As a result of this kind of focus, the Participants formulated specific objectives for students. The following are representative:

1) To understand the responsibilities, the functions and operations of librarianship, and the most pressing problems in the profession.

2) To understand communication theory and information science, particularly as they relate to the transfer of information from one person to another, or from one group of people to another group.

3) To understand the place of the library in intellectual and cultural history, as well as the discrete history of librarianship.

4) To understand the library's role in a changing community and the librarian's responsibility to the individual in the community.

5) To develop an awareness of the need for continuing professional growth.

6) To understand the ideal of a free and complete dissemination of information and ideas and the problem inherent in the defense of intellectual freedom.

7) To increase an ability to develop, organize, and use resources creatively.

8) To utilize current sources of information by sharing ideas during and outside of class.

9) To identify and solve problems using logic, statistics, systems analysis and a wide range of research methods.

Some of these objectives relate to the acquisition and understanding of knowledge; others relate to attitudes and behavior. The Participants assumed

that if the student was to be prepared for a professional role in librarianship, the student should not only develop leadership capability but also learn principles and theory as a dependable basis for evaluating alternatives and making decisions involving change.

Throughout these discussions the Participants had referred to the organization that would implement the program planned during the Institute as the Graduate Library School. However, in February they agreed and subsequently obtained the Trustee's approval to name the new school the College of Librarianship. They rejected the use of either library science or information science in preference to the use of librarianship to clearly distinguish the professional nature of its function.

The Participants agreed that the curriculum would include an oreintation workshop, a foundations (i.e. core) element required of all students, and a group of electives selected by the student in consultation with a faculty advisor because of their relevance to the student's interests and career goals. The curriculum would be a carefully planned learning experience for each student. For the full-time student, the curriculum would be completed in ten and a half months. The orientation workshop and the foundations element would comprise a full course load of twelve hours in the first semester, twelve hours of electives would be a full course load in the second semester, and six hours of electives would be a full course load in the first term of the University's summer session.

In a series of conferences with staff members of the University's Social Problems Research Institute during the Institute, the Participants agreed that it would be highly desirable to have an orientation-indoctrination workshop for students. They believed that establishing an open and honest relationship with students was not only an effective way of reinforcing a people-oriented attitude among students but also was a viable basis for their whole learning

experience in the program. Recognizing that as much or more learning takes place outside the classroom as within, the Participants were eager to use an Orientation Workshop to accelerate the process of knowing each other well enough to share experience and to be supportive of one another. The Participants also agreed that the workshop could influence constructively the student's decisions of electives and career goals to the extent that the experience increased the student's self-understanding and the Participants' understanding of the student as a unique person.

The portion of the curriculum required of all students will constitute the "core" but it will differ from the core curriculum in other graduate library schools in most respects. The Participants agreed to use the title, Professional Seminar, for the core curriculum to differentiate its character and format. Its description in terms of four three-hour courses is a concession to academic procedures and course format established at the University of South Carolina. Instead of offering the four courses concurrently, they will be offered block-on-end through the semester to accommodate the integration of content in a sequence compatible with the practice of librarianship. The involvement of the entire faculty in these four courses will insure the in-put of every Participant, each of whom was selected because of differing interests, experience, and education. The combined expertise of all the faculty includes the several functions performed in libraries and the various types of library/information services. During the first semester, the graduate student will acquire a common introduction to career opportunities as well as an understanding of the actualities and potentialities of the profession. Further, the student will learn that information sciences, communication, human relations, and media studies are an integral part of professional library education. The unity of the information profession will be emphasized to help the student understand the role of the librarians in relation to other professionals involved in

information services. These four courses will present the patterns of information flow in society today, the origin of information, individual and mass communication, the availability of information from printing to electronic reproduction, the storage and processing of information, and the way information is needed and used by people.

Each of the Participants identified units of content essential in the Professional Seminar and these units involved communication, management, technology, materials, services, human relations, methods and processes, and professionalism. The rationale for integrating the content of the Professional Seminar was that the Participants believed that students would thereby obtain a comprehensive and realistic understanding of librarianship, important content would not be overlooked or understressed, and unnecessary duplication of content could be eliminated. They also believed that the Professional Seminar would minimize the problem of the inevitable uneven background of knowledge and experience of students and would avoid misleading students through discrete problems and courses by introducing them to the library as a working system in society. Further, they believed that the Professional Seminar would accommodate issues of ethics, censorship, intellectual freedom, privacy of inquiry, etc. which are not the peculiar responsibilities of administrative, technical or public services. They agreed that the content should be integrated rather than structured by function (courses in cataloging and classification, reference, organization of libraries, and the library as a special institution), but the problem was finding an alternative model for content sequence. The Participants considered several models and selected David Easton's model of a political system described in his An Analysis of Political Systems and recommended by Dr. Ernest DeProspo of Rutgers University. A schematic presentation of the model and a sequence of content is included in Appendix II.

The Participants agreed that team teaching of the Professional Seminar was essential. All believed that students should have the advantage of the combined experience and expertise of the Participants, no one or combination of whom could as adequately cover the content as could the group. They also believed that exposure of the student to the total faculty could be a more meaningful reflection of the real world of libraries. A description of the Professional Seminar and a schedule of the sequence of content is included in Appendix III.

Each of the Participants also identified and submitted to the group detailed statements of elective courses reflecting area of individual expertise and designed to expand the learning acquired by the student in the foundations course. They are also designed to provide an opportunity to pursue in greater depth the student's particular needs and interests. The student may be an experienced librarian who needs special study in library systems design and automation, interpersonal communication and group development, or information networks and bibliographic control. The student may on the other hand select courses with a special career goal in mind. The latter may be a school media specialist, a public library reference librarian, a cataloger, information officer for a company or community agency. The student will also have the opportunity of electing courses outside the College of Librarianship if a graduate course offered by another department will satisfy his needs and interests.

The elective courses will be structured for the most part in one-credit modules to give the student a wide range of choices. The Participants recognized that the conventional three-hour course could involve the student in unnecessary repetition or in learning experiences in which the student lacked interest and/or motivation. They believed that the content of electives offered in one-credit courses would not only make the content more visible to the student but also eliminate the unnecessary duplication of content. The results would be greater

success in student's program and increased efficiency in the use of instructions. The Participants realized that any departure from the conventional three-hour semester course could create problems in scheduling, registration, and grading. The scheduling problem was resolved by dividing the University's fifteen-week semester into three five week modules and using one module for each one credit course. Some of the latter fit into sequences of three courses extending throughout the semester. In the same way, the summer term of six weeks would accommodate three two-week modules i.e. three one-credit courses. It was agreed to involve the students in the selection of course offerings for the second semester next year and for the first term of the 1973 Summer session, and to use a computer program to schedule the courses. A description of the elective courses which the Participants are prepared to offer is included in Appendix IV.

Instructional Equipment and Materials

The equipment and materials for the Institute consisted primarily of a blackboard, cassette tape recorders, duplicating equipment, an overhead projector, and an electronic calculator, for these were the principal requirements for the planning year.

However, in view of the interrelationship of equipment and materials with the proposed library school and its curriculum, instructional aids and materials were constantly being received and reviewed by the Participants. The Participants, particularly the chairman of the Resources and Equipment Committee, viewed equipment on demonstration, obtained reports on the experiences of persons already using certain equipment, and looked at proposed instructional methodology in terms of the materials and equipment being acquired. Books for the cataloging and reference lab were being received during this time, and Participants with specialties in these fields inspected shipments of gifts for the practice collections; one Participant went to the Library of Congress to select materials

which the Library makes available from its unwanted or duplicated books. New books, often in multiple copies, were also purchased for this lab, as well as for the lab in children's literature.

Instructional equipment and materials, other than books in the practice and reference collections and office and classroom fixtures included:

2 platen presses
1 proof press
1 visual maker
1 Dalite portable projection screen
1 Kodak Ertagraphic slide projector AF-2
1 Polaroid camera
1 Instamatic camera
1 35-MM camera
1 videotape camera with zoom lens and tripod
1 potable videotape unit
4 16-MM projectors
3 overhead projectors
1 opaque projector
1 film strip
1 Xerox 914
3 Kodak Ertagraphic carousel projectors
6 Panasonic cassette tape recorders
1 videotape recorder
4 film strip viewers - manual
1 film strip viewer - automatic
1 automatic film-strip viewer with record assembly
2 listening centers
3 Sony conference microphones
1 Thermafax copying machine
3 record players
12 film strip catridges
1 videotape monitor
1 photocopy stand with lights
1 illustrated drawing board with luxo-lamp
12 headphones
1 Sony reel-to-reel tape recorder
2 videotape battery chargers
1 seal dry mount press
1 paper cutter
1 tape sign machine

The above equipment is housed in the College of Librarianship, but in addition, equipment in other departments is available for instruction. A Participant, whose speciality is data processing, surveyed the University facilities in this field and obtained approval for unlimited use of keypunches, sorters, collator, interpreter, reproducer, decollator, IBM 360/65, PDP-11, card

readers, line printers, D314 disk devices, magnetic tape devices, and Digetak optical reader. In addition, an off-set press is available for use for purposes of publication. The resources of a well-equipped TV studio are also available.

During the spring and summer months, physical facilities for the opening of the planned College of Librarianship were undergoing renovation and equipping. The facilities preparation included two classrooms, three seminar rooms, a teaching/laboratory for children's and young adult's materials, and audio-visual production laboratory, a reference and cataloging laboratory, a research laboratory, a student lounge, and a number of work stations for graduate and student assistants. The Participants spent considerable time in the planning and supervision of this work as well as the equipment and materials which were received. These elements of the program were the responsibility of task-oriented committees and the frequency of group meetings diminished. For the most part, both general and committee meetings were cassette-taped for purposes of review by Participants, for use as historical documents, and for possible use by future students.

Orientation Workshop

The Orientation Workshop, planned as the final phase of the Institute was both an end and a beginning. For the Participants it represented a kind of testing ground for the various assumptions and hypotheses which had emerged during the planning year. For the candidates entering the program it was an introduction to the projected program and learning experience.

The Workshop held at Kanuga Conference Center September 6, 7, and 8, 1972 was the result. In this Workshop, conducted by two consultants from the Social Problems Research Institute, the Participants of the Institute and the students met together to achieve goals developed during the Institute. The goals were to permit

faculty and students to become acquainted, to establish close, honest relationships between all the Participants, to help both groups form a working unit, and to develop congruence with regard to curricular goals and to the total program.

Techniques which the consultants used to facilitate these goals were planned interactions and open, free time so that there could be a maximum of different kinds of experiences in small groups, large groups, and informal gatherings, Some sessions were devoted to answering questions, while others were aimed at developing some self-awareness and awareness of the characteristics of others in the program. In small groups, the Student Participants formulated an agenda of concerns. The latter were assembled and classified by general areas of concern (student evaluation, expectations of instructors, placement, accreditation, etc.) and discussed in interest groups. Meal times, recreation periods, and "happy hours" contributed immeasurably to process of learning to know each other. The facilities and environment were ideal for this purpose. At the outset, individual reaction to the Oreintation Workshop varied among the Student Participants from strongly negative to strongly positive. However during the Workshop, much of the apprehension disappeared, openness was less of a threat, and the colleague relationship of students and instructors was more comfortable.

Budget

The total amount funded by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for the Institute was $32,585.00. The principal direct cost--$13,367.46--was for supportive personnel who assisted the Participants throughout the planning year. Consultant services and travel came to $9,461.69. Domestic travel for Participants amounted to $4,540.27. Supplies and fringe benefits cost a total of $955.78. Another major cost was the Orientation Workshop, which cost $1,845.80. Indirect costs totalled $2,414.00.

It should be noted that the above amounts supplemented University funds for the salaries of Participants, equipment, and remodeling of the quarters.

The grant was indispensable for acquiring top-notch consultants, for affording money for extensive travel and for making the developing program visible not only within the state but nationwide.

THE EVALUATION

An evaluation of the Institute involves a measure of the Participants' effectiveness in achieving the objectives of the Institute. The latter relate to both the faculty of the College of Librarianship and to the students in the Orientation Workshop. The latter also relate to provision in the program for evaluating the academic achievement of students. An evaluation of the Institute involves the institutional and external professional review and criticism of the Participants' achievement in designing a program (i.e. the product) and in group development (i.e. the process).

The Program

During the Institute, the Participants achieved all four objectives. The extent to which they conducted a community analysis of information needs and services was adequate for curricular planning and for establishing working relationships between the Participants and leaders in government agencies, civic and religious organizations and librarianship. They designed a curriculum of basic professional education with course objectives, descriptions, and outlines. They developed instructional resources and selected teaching methods calculated to maximize learning. These teaching methods include team teaching, simulation and gaming, case study, problem solving, lectures, independent study, internship, audio-visual presentation, and tutorials. Also the Participants selected fifty students and forty-seven of them enrolled in the program. Their performance in the Orientation Workshop confirmed their enthusiasm, self-directions and commitment to librarianship. The Participants see in the student group the effectiveness of the selection procedure in identifying individuals who are likely to complete the program

successfully and perform effectively as librarians.

Methods for evaluation of achievement of both general and specific objectives are provided in the insturctional program, and the projected schedule of the Professional Seminar, for example, provides adequate time for testing the validity of the objectives as well as their achievement by students. Degree candidates will be examined at intervals to measure individual achievement. The Participants are experienced in student evaluation and will use a variety of methods to compensate for the individual differences in students. All evaluation will be discussed with the student in conferences. The validity of these methods will be increased by using the student's self-evaluation in the process.

The Participants were constantly evaluating their progress but they were also aware of the need for objective evaluation of program plans by those outside the group. During the fall, they invited Dr. Jay Dailey, Dr. Ernest DeProspo, and Dr. Miles Martin to review and react to preliminary plans for the Master's degree program. They supported the philosophical position of the Participants and reinforced the planners determination to find a viable way to integrate the core curriculum.

It was eventually time for evaluation of this product, and the Participants spent several sessions in determining who would be best qualified to make objective evaluation of the curriculum and the plans for its presentation to the entering students.

In mid-April, 1972, a team of objective evaluators was invited to look at the curriculum and the plans for its presentation. In a number of conferences with the Participants both in groups and individually these consultants came up with several valuable observations about the program, its objectives and the various mechanisms for carrying them out. These consultants were repre-

sentatives from more than one area of education. Three of them were faculty members from other graduate library schools, one was a professor of sociology, one was a practicing librarian, and the sixth member was an ex-faculty member from a graduate library school, an ex-president of the American Library Association and currently employed as a consultant with one of the larges library supply houses. A copy of their report is appended (see Appendix V).

One of their most valuable suggestions had to do with measuring objectives:

> As much documentation as possible should be compiled during the first year of operation. It should include data on students admitted, on student performance and progress, and personal evaluations of the program by students and faculty at several points during the year. (The documentation of who are admitted and the data upon which these decisions are based should be recorded in considerable detail, in order to provide the basis for determining policy at a later date).

This suggestion was already being followed, but the emphasis placed by the visiting team on documentation caused the Participants to reexamine the vehicles for evaluation with a view to affording even more effective access to information on students and their performance.

The first opportunity for implementing those decisions and plans occurred during the Orientation Workshop. The effectiveness in achieving the goals of the workshop is reflected in the summary statement which is appended (see appendix II). This summary is based on a questionnaire administered to all Participants - faculty and students.

In further analyzing the material on the last page of the questionnaire, the mean ratings were obtained with the following results: that high scores were awarded to the fact that the Workshop was one that was needed, 6.0 indicating very high agreement; that it was beneficial; that it was worthwhile; that it was valuable. Rejected were the ideas that the Workshop was irrelevant, too formal, too structured. Other scores following well above the

mean were formative, interesting, productive, provocative, well planned and stimulating. Thus, while there was some dissenting opinion in that some individuals felt that they needed more structure, the overwhelming response to the Workshop was positive and supportive. It is the opinion of the staff of the Social Problems Research Institute that the Workshop was highly successful and that recommendations for attempting something similar in the future are most desirable.

The nature of the program developed during the Institute has had an impact on academic planning within the University. Officials feel vindicated for the investment of time and manpower in planning a new graduate professional program. At the same time the Graduate Faculty, generally conservative and apprehensive about change, objected to a twelve-hour course (the Professional Seminar) and the extensive use of one-hour courses (the elective courses). Most of the objections stemmed from the fact that they incorrectly assumed the format was incompatible with the University's registration and academic record procedures. The Graduate Faculty also questioned the criteria for selecting students and again incorrectly assumed that a failure to use the established measures of eligibility (GRE score of 1000 and CGPA of B) would lower academic achievements in the Graduate School enrollment. The willingness of the Participants to experiement with non-conventional academic structures or formats and to use a variety of learning experiences in graduate education has identified them with those factions in the University community concerned with excellence in teaching and academic accountability. The program planned during the Institute was evaluated and approved by the Graduate Faculty of the University and the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education. The program will be evaluated by the profession through the performance of graduates in library positions.

Evaluation of the Process

The importance of the product was anticipated by the Participants but the importance of the process was not. Reference to group development was made earlier in this Report, but the change that took place during the Institute in developing understanding and the ability to work together deserves amplification.

The chief learning experience by the Participants was how individuals in a group must surrender autonomy for achievement of broad purposes agreed upon in advance. There were surprises in the process of trying to take several quite valid viewpoints and blending them into a more valid whole. Development of objectives was slowed down by a desire by Participants to be agreeable. Fear of sounding authoritatian inhibited some members from valuable input. From others there was too much input so that focus on primary objectives got lost among minor or, at least, premature concerns. Conflicts were inevitable, and these had to be resolved in a number of ways. One important way was self-examination and role identification. One or two of the Participants felt they lacked credibility with the group; others found that non-verbal communication was saying the wrong things. Some of these conflicts had to be handled by expert assistance.

The Participants reported to the staff of the University's Social Problems Research Institute that there were a number of potential problems and dilemmas that they were having. The behavioral scientists from the Institute were brought in as consultants in order to help in both the planning endeavor as well as in the group dynamics principles that seemed to be giving the Participants some difficulty. Different ones in the Institute gave different reasons for why the Institute staff should be brought in as consultants but the various reasons primarily concerned: difficulty in attaining a finished product while

using a democratic model in the staff decision-making line process (as opposed to the usual departmental function of autocrat commanding or ordering specific functions to be executed), some morale problems on the part of various individuals, sub-groups or cliques which had developed and may, or may not, have been interfering with the effective functioning of the entire group in planning for their academic program, and the recognition that unless behavior changed appreciably that the deadlines adopted by the Participants would not be met. In November, the Participants agreed they needed professional advice on group development and they discussed their need with the staff of the University's Social Problem Research Institute. Two members of that staff attended several institute meetings as passive observers and began an interaction with the Participants which continued throughout the Institute.

There appeared to be a general acceptance for the need for consultants and a willingness to become involved with them. The consultants accepted responsibility for diagnosing dilemmas and difficulties in the functioning of the Participants as a group. After approximately three or four weeks of aperiodic interactions between the consultants and the Participants, a general feedback session occurred in which there was sharing of diagnostic difficulties as well as improvement in the group functioning. The principal causes of problems were the failure of Participants to listen to each other, lack of support for each others ideas, a reluctance do deal openly with emotion-charged issues, confusion about leadership roles, and an inability to resolve personality conflicts.

The group was functioning under the model of a democratic administration and the majority of the Participants had had limited experience working in such a system. Consequently they had difficulty understanding what was expected of the individual and of the group. A second overriding difficulty was that the majority of the Participants had not had professional experience making managerial decisions about policy.

The primary strength in the group was a clear cut recognition that there were difficulties affecting the functioning of the group and need for a marked change in behavior before adequate progress could be made. Another strength was a very high level of both professional and personal involvement in the way in which people worked on the goals that they were assigned. Consequently the individual's as well as the group's motivation level was extremely high. An additional strength was that there was a wealth of talent in the group with very little overlap in specialization and consequently the group included an expert in most areas of librarianship.

The consultants discussed strengths and weaknesses with the Participants on various occasions and over a period of time rather than at one meeting. The consultants used exercises to change behavior patterns in the group with some success, and in January proposed an off-campus retreat at which the focus would be organizational development. The Participants discussed the proposal a number of times over a period of several weeks in an effort to understand the nature and potentiality of a sensitivity training session. The Participants, with some reservation and apprehension, accepted the proposal and made arrangements for the training session at Litchfield Inn on the coast of South Carolina March 15-17, 1972 using statements of each Participant's needs and desires. The consultants identified the following tasks as agenda items:

1. Working on roles that individual members play including team-role expectancies.
2. Knowing more about each other as "people"
3. Learning to develop support, empathy, and acceptance of group decisions
4. Developing of trust and openness
5. Defining the role of the associate dean and that of the dean

Additional preplanning of the training session involved the collection of data by the two consultants from each of the Participants in private interviews. The data were answers to the questions about what each Participant did that facilitated group decisions and what each did that blocked or hindered group decisions. An analysis of these data by the consultants confirmed certain hypothesis they had made about the feelings of Participants regarding interpersonal relationships in the group and about the roles that others in the group played.

The facilities at Litchfield Inn provided an opportunity for privacy and for socialization during meals and also for a sense of being together in a remote unhurried atmosphere where interpersonal relationships could be worked on both formally and informally.

The opening phase of the workshop focused on a fantasy and non-verbal exercise for all Participants. The primary goal of this exercise was to achieve for each individual Participant a focusing in on himself as an individual not as a member of a group. The fantasy exercise involved allowed the Participant to be hypersensitive to his uniqueness as a person.

Following this exercise the Participants shared the meaning of the experience which individuals had just gone through. This process shifted the focus away from the individual as a unique person to that of an individual who is functioning within a group that has had common experiences. The Participants related more easily and with a great deal of facility to the entire group because of their commonality in their initiation of the group process. Although the consultants had planned an extensive, though somewhat flexible, structure for the training session, the stated or voiced needs of individual Participants in the group or the consensus of group opinion dictated the topics and goals of the entire session. Numerous planned implementation methods were utilized. However, the consultants devised new exercises and new ways of implementing goals

of the workshop as stated needs surfaced.

The primary focus during the training session was on the building trust in relationships and developing openness in verbal interactions between Participants. The organizational norms of the Institute and how they evolved was one discussion topic. Another one was the effect of personal interaction on the professional and working relationship of the Participants. A third topic was the role of the Dean in the group and his inevitable influence on attitudes of the other Participants. A topic which occupied at least eight hours of the working portion of the training session was a unique relationship that had developed between two of the Participants and its effort on others in the group. The openness and frankness of this discussion created a model for the discussion of interpersonal relationships of other Participants.

A tentative decision had been made by the consultants that data derived from interviews as a part of the preplanning would be fed back to the Participants at the training session. This decision was reversed, however, because of the straightforward, honest and sometimes emotionally charged statements of the Participants. This ambivalence on the part of the consultants was immediately resolved at the training session because Participants expressed their feelings with equal candor and forthrightness.

The Participants actually used the training session as an intensive, three-day faculty meeting during which they dealt with an important agenda they had previously avoided, not deliberately but because of inadequately developed group process skills. Strong personal committment, the professional consultant's artful direction, and the environment contributed to the Participant's personal growth and group development. It was a meaningful learning experience and was a catalytic event in the Institute. The training session accelerated the process of Participants' learning to work together, accepting the creative dimension of

others in the group, resolving conflict, and evaluating the results of team effort.

During the Institute the Participants developed their skill in functioning as individuals in a group and skill in functioning as a group. This development prepared the Participants for the Orientation Workshop and the student did see the faculty as a working team. This development will continue as the group moves from the Institute to projected library education program and will be a essential basis for team teaching and curriculum planning.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Participants recommend:

1. The product of the Institute, the multi-purpose basic professional education program in librarianship, be offered at the University of South Carolina. They have confidence in the program and want an opportunity to evaluate it in terms of the student's achievement and the graduate's performance on the job.

2. The Orientation Workshop be an integral part of the program. They believe that the experience of this final activity in the Institute is a valid method of establishing rapport between students and their peers as well as their instructors and of creating the climate for the subsequent learning experiences.

3. The Institute, or planning year, precede the establishment of a graduate library school. They believe that this opportunity to reexamine graduate library education enables a new faculty not only to profit from experience of other schools but also to find alternative solutions to problems. At the same time they believe that the best curriculum planning is accomplished with students.

Beyond these major recommendations, the Participants learned some things the hard way. In the first place the Director limited his preplanning to the product and innocently assumed that individuals naturally know how to function in groups. All of the Participants anticipated internal and external evaluation of the Institute but did not fully appreciate the necessity of identifying at the outset the kinds of data and evidence which would have to be accumulated throughout the activities. The training session in group development should have been the first order of business and the consultants from the

University's Social Problems Research Institute should have worked with the group diagnosing problems and evaluating effectiveness during the first part of the Institute. The PERT chart was an exceedingly useful tool but if it had been earlier the Participants very well may have better understood the time constraints and the interrelationship of tasks. Everyone in the group was conscious of time constraints but only a few saw the time-table realistically. While it was essential to devote some time to sharing personal philosophy and points of view in a group, the Participants erred in their preoccupation with goals and objectives. They also erred in thinking that all planning could be accomplished via group discussion. Task oriented sub-groups should have been formed earlier in the Institute and their proposals based on in-depth discussion should have been reported to the group for review, revision and action. This was the model that the Participants finally adopted and should have been using throughout the Institute.

If a similar Institute is contemplated the Participants recommend that it extend over an eighteen month period. The first six months should be devoted to the planning of the program by the group. The last twelve months should be devoted to the implementation of the program with part of the faculty teaching and part of the faculty planning at all times. Evaluators of both the product and the process should be involved at the beginning of the Institute and should receive throughout data and evidence they need to perform their function.

APPENDIX III

College of Librarianship
University of South Carolina

Professional Seminar in Librarianship

LIBR 701 — Social Basis of Information. Introduction to communication theory as it relates to the transfer of information from one person to another or from one group of people to another group. Explores the problems of freedom of access to information, with particular reference to the place of the library in intellectual and cultural role of the library.

LIBR 702 — Libraries in Information Systems. Examines the library as an integral part of information networks and looks at some of the theories and methodologies of the disciplines included in these networks.

LIBR 703 — Processes of Information Services. Considers the means by which information centers meet the information needs of their communities. Covers the acquisition and organization of information and the administrative techniques necessary for providing effective service.

LIBR 704 — Planning, Design and Evaluation of Library Systems. Introduction to the tools and research methods by which libraries develop strategies to meet information needs and to evaluate effectiveness with which these needs are met.

APPENDIX IV

College of Librarianship
University of South Carolina

Elective Courses

History of Libraries

LIBR 706 Ancient and Medieval Libraries - Preservation of literature from the earliest days of recorded civilization in Mesopotamia, through Pre-Hellenistic Greece, Alexandria, Pergamum, Rome and the Roman Empire, to the Renaissance. Consideration of availability of books and the way in which they were acquired. (1 credit)

LIBR 707 The Popular Library - Types of popular libraries. The library as a social institution. The library in a free society, in communist countries, in underdeveloped lands. Library users by social classification. (1 credit)

The Book as an Artifact

LIBR 708 Descriptive Bibliography. - Historical and analytical bibliography as methods of investigation. Laboratory investigation of primacy of edition. Bibliographical descriptions for rare books: various evidence brought to bear on descriptions. (1 credit)

LIBR 709 Printing - (Applied) Laboratory experience in design and production of broadsides and books. Examination of paper, typefaces, composition and other elements of bookmaking. (1 credit)

Forms and Movements of Publication

LIBR 710 Backgrounds of Modern Publishing. The social forces which directed the shape of modern publishing, and the way in which publishing has made an impact on society. The changing picture of economics of publishing from the small family shop to the publishing empires of today. (1 credit)

LIBR 711 Publication and Social Charge - Trends affecting freedom of access to information. Consideration of information as property vs. fair use and implications for scholarship. Censorship in its many forms and its role in the library of the future. (1 credit)

The Evolution of the Book

LIBR 712 The Manuscript Book- The alphabet and the conception of early forms in which knowledge was recorded - cuneiform, papyrus, parchment paper. Consideration of changes brought about by adoption of codex. The role played by monasteries in preparation for the modern book. (1 credit)

LIBR 713 The Printed Book - The revolution brought about the invention of printing. The spread of printing and the development of national characteristics. The impact of humanism. Characteristics of the book during the first four centuries of printing (1 credit)

LIBR 714 The Mechanical Book - Technical advances during the 19th century in paper, presses, type casting, and composition binding. Book design and the private press movement. Modern departures form the codex-audio, microform, computer storage - and speculations about the future. (1 credit)

Information Processing

LIBR 715 Bibliographic Description of Materials - Emphasis on the various codes used by librarians to provide a standard bibliographic description of materials, both print and non-print. The rules of cataloging will be studied in order to better understand how to both create and use access tools to information. (1 credit)

LIBR 716 Classification of Information - The two major classification schemes used in the United States, the Dewey Decimal Classification and the Library of Congress Classification. The basic structure of each classification scheme will be investigates, as well as some of the problems of application and change. (1 credit)

LIBR 717 Subject Analysis of Information - Subject analysis will be approached from the viewpoint of the standard subject heading tools, as a means of providing access to information, as well as an introduction to indexing theory and methodology as an alternate means. (1 credit)

Special Materials

LIBR 718 Serials - The study of serial publications according to some basic problems of acquisition, cataloging, storage and conversation. Will include an introduction to computer applications in serial work. (1 credit)

LIBR 719 Government Publications - The nature of American documents, both federal and state, some official publications of Great Britain and Canada, as well as United Nations documents. The techniques of acquisition and organization will be covered, but not the reference use. (1 credit)

LIBR 720 Non-Print Materials - Special problems in the description, handling and subject access to the more commonly used non-print sources of information and such as films, records, maps, slides, tapes, microforms, realia, etc. (1 credit)

Technical Services

LIBR 721 Acquisitions - Will consider some of the current issues on acquisitions work, such as non-print, rare and out of print materials, foreign materials, standing and blanket order purchasing. Application of mechanized equipment will also be introduced. (1 credit)

LIBR 722 Circulation - The total role of the circulation function within the library structure, as well as considering the varieties and purposes of circulation control systems. (1 credit)

LIBR 723 Centralized and Cooperative Services - The role of the Library and the technical services department in evaluating and using the existing cooperative and centralized services provided by the Library of Congress, regional systems and commerical-firms. (1 credit)

LIBR 724 Problems in Technical Services - It is usually recommended that this course be taken at the end of the program, and may be negotiated with the instructor for one, two or three credits. The student would identify a problem or area of special interest and would work out a program to either conduct a small research project or follow a tutorial program of reading/discussion. (1-3 credits)

Library Administration

LIBR 730 Problems in Library Administration - Frequently occuring practica problems, relating to budgeting, management, personnel, supervision of library operations. Case study method relied on heavily and students will also observe in libraries. (1 credit)

LIBR 731 Legal Problems in Library Administration - The legal basis of libraries and the kinds of legal problems which can be presented by copyright, censorship, liability laws, personnel regulations, due process in employment and dismissal staff. Course materials drawn form currently pending cases and from case studies. (1 credit)

Library Facilities

LIBR 732 Planning Library Facilities - Problems in the design of space fc library services and functions. Examples of successful and unsuccessful design of building. Emphasis on renovation of existing space as well as design of new spaces. (1 credit)

LIBR 733 Problems in Library Facilities Planning - Design of space and evaluation of these designs. Development of building programs as guidance to architects and designers. Field trips to examine library buildings recently completed and under constructions. (1 credit)

LIBR 734 Libraries In the Political Process - The strategies of Library service agencies and organizations in the political process at the national, state and local levels. The functions of library organizations as interest groups, the mobilization of community support for libtary programs and the political constraints limiting the development of library services. (1 credit)

LIBR 735 Role and Function of State Library Agencies - The library functions of the states and the variety of library structures at the state level. Programs of statewide library development and the role of the state in funding library services and establishing standards for the quality of library services available to citizens. (2 credits)

LIBR 736 Library Services to Institutionalized and Physically Handicapped Populations. The problems and needs involved in providing library services to institutionalized persons, including correctional, mental and health institutions. The provision of services to handicapped persons unable to read conventional printed material because of physical handicap including blindness, and nervous disorders. (1 credit)

LIBR 737 Management of Library Operations. Techniques of management appropriate to library operations, problems of materials handling and delivery in the library. Supervision of technical, circulation and public service operations. Examination of library manual and mechanical systems. (1 credit)

LIBR 738 Building a Library Staff Team. Experience in planning team building strategies of a library staff. Work in a variety of team building situations provide the student with feedback on his diagnosis, design, and evaluation skills. Students teams will conceptualize their own theories of team building. (1 credit)

LIBR 739 Public Library Issues Seminar. The societal forces affecting the public library. Issues relating to service to disadvantaged persons, the decline of inner city public libraries and the development of new patterns of public library service in rural and suburban communities. (1 credit)

Data and Information

LIBR 740 The Psychological Aspects of Information. Characteristics of the human as the processor of information. Emphasis given to data collection, data transmission, transformation of data to information, utilization of information, and decision making. (1 credit)

LIBR 741 The Sociological Aspects of Information. The structure of society, the generation of data and the informational value of data. Information as a social resource, the power of information to examine the context of a complex modern society. (1 credit)

LIBR 744 National and Trade Bibliography. Investigation of the concept of complete national bibliographic services, with an historical survey of systematic listing of national book production and an analysis of contemporary attempts to achieve integrated bibliographic control in various nations and cooperation on the regional, national and international level. Special emphasis on the practical uses of bibliographies. (2 credits)

LIBR 745 Information Sources, Services and Research in the Social Sciences A survey and evaluation of the literature--its nature, history, and bibliographic organization--of the social sciences, with special emphasis on the basic concepts, patterns of communication and methods of research in the different fields. Each student explores an individual field, its historical development, bibliographic structure, and principal types of literature. (2 credits)

LIBR 746 Information Sources, Services and Research in the Humanities. A survey and evaluation of the literature--its nature, history and bibliographic organization--of the humanities, with special emphasis on the basic concepts, patterns of communication and methods of research and creative work in the different fields. Each student explores an individual field, its historical development, bibliographic structure, and principal types of literature. (2 credits)

LIBR 747 Information Sources, Services, and Research in Science and Technology - Coverage of the nature of knowledge, research and publication in the sciences and technology with emphasis on bibliographical structure and on sources used in building and servicing collections and in providing information in the different fields. Each student explores an individual field, its historical development, bibliographic structure and principal types of literature. (2 credits)

LIBR 748 Business Information Sources and Services. Coverage of the bibliographic apparatus relevant to contemporary managerial information needs, with emphasis on the literature of business and finance: bibliographics, statistical materials and business services. Consideration of specialized problems related to the organization and operation peculiar to business library service. (1 credit)

LIBR 749 Seminar in Special Librarianship. Survey of the development and present status of scientific medical, institutional, and technical libraries with emphasis on students' interest areas; discussion of research methods in major disciplines and their implications for the special librarian; administration, public services, and special materials, supervised field trips. (2 credits)

LIBR 750 Information Networks. Identification and evaluation of the numerous networks that provide information and/or referral services. Field trips affording students opportunity to make observations and comparisons of the different types of information networks, their present services and prospects for the future. (2 credits)

LIBR 755 Administration of the School Media Program - Function, organization, and management of the school media center and program. Emphasis on philosophy, purpose, techniques, and practices. (3 credits)

LIBR 756 Selection and Evaluation of Materials for Children (N-6). Reading interests and needs of this age group as they relate to the principals of selection of print and non-print materials and to their use for curriculum and recreational purposes. Special selection aids, reviewing tools, indexes, etc. Extensive reading and examination of books and non-print materials in: Language Arts, Social Studies, and Science. (1-3 credits.)

LIBR 757 Selection and Evaluation of Materials for Young People. (7-12) Extensive reading of books and examination of related materials germane to current curriculum and recretional interests and needs of young people. Study of special selection tools, bibliographic sources, and indexes. (3 credits)

Oral Interpretation of Children's Literature

LIBR 758 Oral Interpretation of Children's Literature Through Poetry. Special emphasis upon the sheer delight of poetry through individual reading choral reading, etc. Forms and contents of poetry for children, favorite poets, specialized anthologies and collections. Creative efforts of children. Extensive reading and use of tapes, cassettes, and other media. (1 credit)

LIBR 759 Oral Interpretation of Children's Literature Through Storytelling. The Literature of the storyteller. Techniques of reading aloud. The storyteller in action. (1 credit)

LIBR 760 Oral Interpretation of Children's Literature Through Creative Presentations. Interpreting books through creative dramatics, puppetry, games, music, art activities, etc. (1 credit)

LIBR 761 Supervision of School Media Programs at the District and State Level. Definition and history of school media supervision. Functions, characteristics, techniques, responsibilities, of school media supervisor. Prerequisite-previous courses in school and experience in school media centers. (3 credits)

LIBR 762 Problems in School Media Programs. Special problems selected in cooperation with faculty and students. (1-3 credits)

LIBR 766 Libraries and Higher Education. Problems of post high school education and strategies to meet changes. Information systems and networks. Degree programs, standards, and learning environment. The function of the library in university teaching and research. Resource planning; policy and decision-making. (1-3 credits)

LIBR 770 Methods of Research in Librarianship. Covers the research process, including problem selection and definition, hypothesis development and evaluation, data collection and analysis and the research methodologies. Study of various research methods applicable to librarianship with illustrations drawn from specific studies of library problems. (1-3 credits)

LIBR 774 Systems of Inquiries. Various systems of inquiry and their application to the design of information systems and the research of information related problems. Attention given to Lockean, Liebnitzin, Kantian, and Hegelian systems of inquiry. The contribution of various disciplines to a science of information. (1 credit)

LIBR 775 Systems Analysis. The tools and techniques utilized in analyzing any system. Particular attention given to identifying the variables and functions of an information system such as a library or special information center. (1 credit)

LIBR 776 Systems Design. Criteria and Methodology for designing and documenting any system. Emphasis on the design of information systems. (1 credit)

LIBR 777 Systems Implementation and Evaluation. Procedures for implementing a system and the problems that may evolve. Methods of evaluating the system and possible evaluation measures that may be utilized. (1 credit)

DATA PROCESSING AND AUTOMATION

LIBR 778 Data Processing Equipment and Its Use. Various machine-readable media and the equipment which automatically processes data on such media. The computer and its application to library automation and information retrieval. (1 credit)

LIBR 779 The Feasibility of Automating A System. How a feasibility study is accomplished. Emphasis given to data collection, information flows, sub-system identification and definition and the generation of recommendations for systems design. (1 credit)

LIBR 780 Management Problems in Automation Systems. A look at library systems that have been automated and the problems associated with personnel, equipment, costs, evaluation time and control factors for such systems. (1 credit)

LIBRARY AUTOMATION

LIBR 781 Programming and Data Management Aspects of Library Automation. The strengths and weaknesses of various computer programming languages, data structures, and operating systems in the context of library automation and information retrieval. (1 credit)

LIBR 782 Design and Implementation of Projects in Library Automation and Information Retrieval. Definition, design, documentation and evaluation for implementation purposes of a project related to library automation and information retrieval. (1-2 credits)

LIBR 783 Man-Machine Communications. The communication difficulties involved in a man-machine system. Emphasis on the human factor element of such a system and the requirements necessary to make such a system successful. (1 credit)

LIBR 784 The Design of an Interacting System. The design implementation and evaluation of a mini-interactive system. Each student responsible for designing mini-interactive systems that incorporates the design criteria. (1-2 credits)

LIBR 785 Problems in Information Science. The state of the art in information science. Information needs and uses, the design evaluation of information systems, information transfers, information technology, linguistics and other aspects of information science. Development by students of quantitative and /or qualitative problems. (1-3 credits)

LIBR 788 Interpersonal Communication in Librarianship. Designed to develop interpersonal communications skills required for effectively functioning as a librarian in today's society. Emphasis upon improved listening, building effective communication patterns, checking perception, communicating pressure, non-verbal communications, and developing self-evaluation techniques. (2 credits)

LIBR 789 Development of Individual Potential As a Librarian. Designed to assist the student in gaining a more positive self-image of himself as an individual and as a librarian. Students will share formative life experiences, achievements and successes and consciously explore and share personal value systems. Constructive feedback from other group members will be utilized. (3 credits.)

LIBR 790 Innovation and Libraries - Development of knowledge, skills and attitudes which the librarian must possess in order to function effectively as an innovator or change agent. Processes of adoption of innovations in various institutions and within individual will be stressed. (1-2 credits)

LIBR 791 Future Functions of Librarianship. Series of three 1 credit module to provide an in depth experience in how to think about, and understand, the role as a librarian and member of society in the future. First module deals primarily with a series of readings and discussions concerning futures. Second module emphasizes various methods of studying futures such as Delphi procedures, cross-impact matrix, and simulation-gaming experience. Third module will focus upon an actual student conducted future oriented study of a selected aspect of librarianship. (1-3 credits)

LIBR 792 Conducting In-Service Training Programs. Designed for librarians responsible for in-service training programs for their staff or cliental. Emphasis upon planning, implementation, evaluation, and follow-up of in-service educational programs. Students will design their own model of an in-service program. (1 credit)

LIBR 793 Role of the Librarian On An Instructional Development Team. Focus upon the role of the librarian as a member of an instructional development team. Student will acquire skills to function effectively in this role through readings, discussions, and experience as a member of an instructional development team. (1 credit.

LIBR 794 Internship in Librarianship. (3-6 credits)

LIBR 796 Independent Study in Librarianship. (1-6 credits)

LIBR 797 Current Issues in Librarianship. Designed for discussion and investigation of issues of current concern to the library profession. (1-3 credits)

APPENDIX V

REPORT OF THE VISITING TEAM FOR EVALUATION

College of Librarianship

University of South Carolina

Dauline Atherton----------Syracuse University

Thomas Childers, Reporting----------Drexel University

William DeJohn----------Missouri State Library

Philip Ennis----------Wesleyan University

Mary Gaver----------Ero-Dart, Inc.

James Holly----------Evergreen State College

I. First Words.

The general report consists of comments and suggestions arrived at in a meeting of all six consultants. For the most part, they are critical or imply criticism of the planning by the College of Librarianship in preparation for the first students entering the fall of 1972. To put those "critical"remarks into context, it must be stressed that the consultants unaminously applaud what has happened within the College this year.

When looking at the faculty, we see a very diverse range of interests and skills; the diversity was probably even more apparent last September. For them to have come together as a close working group in pursuit of a highly integrated program, is a considerable achievement.

We congratulate the faculty on planning a program in library education that promises to be one of the most unique in the country--a significant contribution to the profession and study of librarianship nationwide, and a very hopeful sign for library and information service throughout South Carolina.

II. Objectives: Definition of the School.

It would help to define the program further if its objectives were reformed. In order to serve the College well, the list of Twenty-nine Objectives would profit by compression and judicious paring, and by grouping into natural categories (e.g., "Students," "faculty," " graduates," etc.).

Some additional objectives need to be considered: What kind of person are you trying to produce? What are the situations in which your graduates should find jobs? How do you expect your graduates to contribute to the field of information and library service? In the nation? In South Carolina?

Although some of the Twenty-nine deal with the College's end product, further discussion of the behavior you would like to see on the part of your graduates would be useful in further defining the role and scope of the College.

The selfless approach currently reflected in the Twenty-nine Objectives is less than realistic, particularly in the view of the [illegible] superbl, qualified as scholars and intellectual leaders. The incorporation of objectives related to faculty research, scholarship, consulting, and professional activities would provide a more complete picture of the College's operating goals and at the same time would help assure that the [illegible] professor is part of the student's educational experience.

III. Attaining the Objectives.

The consultants feel that the objectives proposed for the College are for the most part attainable; yet, there are certain conditions that will make their attainment more probable.

1. (The following is offered as one possible way of viewing the resources now existing within the faculty of the College. Similarly, the suggestion for deploying those resources should not be seen as the only way to attain the objectives of the School. However, in the consultants' discussion, it emerged as the most attractive possibility.) Some members of the faculty (Cveljo, Pope, Summers, for example) represent the solid "core" areas of librarianship. We sense that they will most likely be teaching them in a scholarly, intellectual way, in the spirit of inquiry and not in the immediate cliches of practice. Their collective attempts will be to get students to see librarianship as an area of scholarly inquiry. Williams represents a core of knowledge somewhat newer to librarianship (computer technology and information science), and as such illustrates some of the innovation within this program. (Its integration into the curriculum and the Pro Seminar must be approached with great care.) Burge and Bell are also part of the standard concerns of librarianship, and seem to represent the continuity of application and skills [illegible] academic and research concerns.

All these interests can be found in many library schools. It is the integration of all these interests in a particular teaching environment--one of participation and joint inquiry among faculty and students--that is a primary innovation of the College. This is the point at which Atkinson's contribution can best be maximized. His expertise in communication theory and learning theory and method could enhance the Pro Seminar if he were given the responsibility of coordinating, or orchestrating, the whole of the Pro Seminar in order to make it a significant learning experience (to the extent that this can be distinguished from the "content") for each student. This role should be a full-time responsibility for at least the first semester. Since the Pro Seminar will be in an especially developmental stage during the first semester it is taught, it is recommended that this co-ordinator bear no responsibility for any content in the course, but rather devote his full energies to teaching methods, timing, and the atmosphere of learning.

2. Related to our recommendation that the faculty write themselves into the objectives of the College is a suggestion that falls somewhat more into the affective domain.

The faculty will be able to reach the students and make them grow professionally and cognitively insofar as they (faculty) are live persons dealing in a relaxed yet enthusiastic manner about things that count and mean something. Just as the faculty should not ignore their own scholarly interests and should not force themselves

into delivering a content load that does not respect their individual areas of interest. A content package compulsively designed around what "someone" thinks should be covered in a program in librarianship can erode the atmosphere of intellectual puzzlement and enthusiastic inquiry which--your plans make very clear--are major elements in the total educational package. Reconciling this suggestion with the recommendation that a conceptual model be adopted for developing the Pro Seminar will not be easy. Considerable care will be needed in order to cover the content and at the same time maintain a free spirit in the program.

3. From what we could observe, the Dean appears to have assumed an inordinately heavy load for the College. He is playing the part of both an inside and an outside man--relating the College to the University administration, State, profession, and nation, while at the same time assuming the top management role within the College. In order to reduce the burden on the Dean, and in order to capitalize on his well-developed working relationship with the University administration and with the profession as a whole, we suggest that he focus his efforts on relating the College to the external environment, and that the management of internal operations of the College be laid explicitly on the Assistant Dean.

IV. Measuring the Objectives.

Two broad recommendations for evaluating the first year of the program:

1. As much documentation as possible should be compiled during the first year of operation. It should include data on students admitted, on student performance and progress, and personal evaluations of the program by students and faculty at several points during the year. (The documentation of who are admitted and the date upon which these decisions are based should be recorded in considerable detail, in order to provide the basis for determining policy at a later date.)

2. One faculty member should be assigned as at least one-half of his regular duties the monitoring of the Pro Seminar, more or less in the role of resident observer.

3. In order to assure a wide range of input for revising the Professional Seminar after the first semester of teaching, we suggest that several faculty members--and at least three--be present at each session of the Professional Seminar, if at all possible.

V. Balance within the Program.

Understanding that the course proposals and outlines we read were not complete, and that a written outline often cannot reflect accurately what will happen in the classroom, there are a number of cautionary notes worth making. Again, there will be the problem of presenting a reasonable coverage of content in an exciting learning atmosphere, while avoiding a concern--compulsive yet

spiritless program.

A. Professional Seminar.

1. Revise the Professional Seminar through selection, compression, and especially integration of the parts that we have seen in preliminary form.

2. Select a conceptual model as a framework for finalizing the Pro Seminar and the development of the electives. (A number of such models can be found in the literature of librarianship--for example, Robert Taylor's "The Making of a Library"). The use of a model that already exists promises to speed the development of a well-integrated Professional Seminar and set of electives.

3. Usage and Services:

   a. As outlined, a great deal of this area is devoted to materials and sources, as opposed to patterns of use or service activities.

   b. All students in the Pro Seminar should be exposed to the full range of services related to libraries and information centers. Biases toward one type of library or another may not be avoidable if a single faculty member is delegated total planning and/or reaching responsibility within a given area. Continued team-planning and team-teaching in September will assure

an adequate mix within content areas.

4. The balance within any area should not be controlled by the composition of the student body. A class in which 75% aspire to be school librarians, for instance, should not be offered a Pro Seminar that is 75% school libraries in content (lecture, field trips, readings, etc.)

5. The "Materials" area would probably profit the student more if it were less materials-oriented and approached the media from the point of view of collection-building. Selection policy and trade and national bibliographies might be considered for inclusion in this segment. The non-print, and perhaps preprint, materials should most certainly be included in order to present a unified picture of the production, distribution, and selection of materials of all kinds, and the building of multi-media files.

6. The "Materials" section seems to be a logical point for the consideration of Machlup-like theories of the growth and distribution of knowledge and information, or social epistemology. Information control, information overload, the paper explosion, and other social problems of knowledge/information flow might also be entertained at this point.

8. Electives.

(We recognize in the following suggestions and comments that at this point the suggested electives are a scattered list and final determination of electives will very much depend upon and flow from the finalized version of the Pro seminar.)

1. Condider an elective in the area of the reading/information interests of adults. This elective might be specially geared to explore service to communities with low literacy rates, such as exist in many places in South Carolina.

2. In talking with the faculty, it became evident that there are some excellent ideas about the development of electives in the area of school libraries. It is just as clear, however, that the planning of these electives cannot wait for the appointment of additional faculty in the area of school library service, no matter how desirable that mey be. Major decisions will have to be made very soon. (An aside related to this area: the present situation, in which the materials collection is part of the classroom, is ideal. It is hoped that even in new quarters this kind of arrangement can be maintained.)

3. A Very practical suggestion related to maintaining an atmosphere of freedom and inquiry not only for the students, but for the faculty as well: There should be some planning of faculty resource allocation in the spring semester in order to telease some faculty who will be teaching in the summer, so that

they can prepare research proposals in order to assure some research activities for the following year.

4. In the same way that the Pro Seminar should not emphasize one type of library or information service while sleighting others so the electives should reflect proportionately the kinds of jobs that the graduates will be expected to seek. For example, if most of the graduates expect to be school librarians, then the electives offered should be greater in that area, and less in an area such as, say, subject resources (Resources in the Social Sciences, Resources in the Humanities, etc.). Although this is not necessarily the way courses would be traded off, it is an example of how total faculty planning for the spring semester might proceed.

5. In designing the curriculum, the faculty should continue to realize that the College of Librarianship exists within the University of South Carolina. Efforts to tap the many resources existing outside the College should be increased.

VI. Support.

It appears that the College of Librarianship has been treated with fair generosity during the gestation year. The Opportunity to plan a unified educational package well before the first student arrives illustrates the University's support of the school; and the Office of Education's institute grant for the support and facilitation of the planning process has further supported the school in ints beginning stages.

Still, there is a deep concern, given the innovative educational program that is being planned--with field trips, gaming and simulation exercises, laboratory sessions, programmed learning devices, audio-visual support, visiting experts, teaching teams, and extensive one-to-one faculty/student interaction--that the University be committed to the program in dollars as well as in spirit--not only this year, but in the years to come. To put in more concrete terms, a striking deficiency appears in the current physical facilities of the College. Although the consultants understand that new housing is in the offing, we feel that we cannot stress too much the importance of designing a physical plant that can comfortably accommodate the pioneering program that is being planned for next year.

VII. Closing Words.

The consultants especially want to commend the faculty for directly confronting their interpersonal differences and conflicts. Although these are real elements in any group, too often they are ignored and in time come to subvert the common goals. This faculty, though, has spent considerable effort in bringing such matters to the surface and resolving them. It seems obvious that such a frank and open relationship has contributed to the current and cooperative spirit among the faculty, and in the first year of teaching--and later--will be a strong positive force in the student's educational environment.

It is clear that the positive interperpersonal atmosphere and the impressive intellectual and scholarly strengths on the faculty of the College of Librarianship will produce one of the strongest, most unique, programs in the country within a short period of time.